

stringent test of balancing the budget in seven years by cutting spending by more than \$850 billion, and it results in even less debt than the plan vetoed by the President. The Coalition budget does not borrow money to pay for tax cuts and it better protects important priorities such as health care, nutrition, job training, education, and infrastructure. Because it does not postpone tough spending cuts, the Coalition plan would leave a national debt of almost \$100 billion less than the Speaker's budget.

I support the Coalition budget for several reasons:

1. It puts deficit reduction first: The Coalition budget makes spending cuts immediately, and postpones tax cuts until the budget is balanced. In contrast, the Speaker's budget would give out \$245 billion in tax cuts early on and delays unpopular spending cuts until after the 1996 and 1998 elections. Under that plan, deficits would actually increase in 1996 and 1997. Congress has passed balanced budget plans before, but most failed because they made popular short-term tax cuts while postponing the tough medicine until many years later. This means that we borrow money to give ourselves a tax cut, leaving our children with the bill. Surely we have learned from recent history that when dessert comes first, we never get to the spinach. The coalition budget begins spending cuts immediately, and makes gradual cuts until the budget is balanced in 2002.

2. It spreads the sacrifice more fairly: The Coalition budget takes a balanced, fiscally responsible approach to major entitlement programs. It trims Medicare costs by allowing recipients to choose private insurance plans and charging upper-income enrollees higher premiums, but it takes \$100 billion less from Medicare than the vetoed budget. These Coalition savings are equal to those necessary to keep the program solvent for the foreseeable future, keeping promises made to both today's and tomorrow's seniors. Medicaid, the program of health insurance for the poor, survives at lower levels than under current law, and with a spending cap that adjusts for inflation and the number of enrollees. It preserves the guarantee of assistance to nursing home residents, the disabled, and lower-income women and children. The Speaker's budget proposal calls for much larger Medicaid cutbacks and takes no account of future enrollment, inflation, or recessions. This approach often hits states like Indiana extremely hard with cumbersome block grant formulas that favor larger states with less efficient health care delivery. Without the Medicaid guarantee, state taxes, local governments, and the middle-class children of nursing home residents will bear the brunt of longterm health care costs. The Coalition plan also proposes cost-of-living adjustments for social security and other federal benefits, but designs those changes so that modest income families will not suffer.

3. It invests in the future: The Coalition budget rejects cutbacks in student loans and job training, choosing instead to create new opportunities for younger Americans. It does not make cuts in research, technology, and export promotion, and it restores funding for education, rural health, research, and economic infrastructure. Overall, the cuts in the Coalition budget are 25 percent less severe than the harsh reductions proposed by the Speaker's budget.

4. It makes work pay, and welfare recipients work: The Coalition budget makes major welfare reform that balances compassion with a sense of personal responsibility. It requires people to move from welfare to work in two years, and provides limited job training and child care to those entering the workforce. The Coalition plan also elimi-

nates the vetoed budget's tax increase on lower-income working families. Welfare should not pay more than work, and this plan helps families make that transition.

5. It enforces strict compliance: The Coalition budget provides the only meaningful enforcement of spending cuts to be found in any of the budget proposals. It uses non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates and includes a line-item veto and tough enforcement measures to make it difficult for any future Congress to violate this plan. This honest approach does not rely on "smoke and mirrors" to achieve a balanced budget. It rejects gimmicks like "unspecified cuts", as in the alternative plans.

Conclusion: I am pleased we have agreed to balance the budget in seven years. Congress and the President must now decide how we balance the budget. To have the long-term support of the American people, a balanced budget plan must make tough budget choices while reflecting the values Americans cherish: responsibility, honesty, fairness, compassion, and the promise that the future will be better for our children. Only a budget that is politically and economically sustainable over a period of years will actually achieve balance.

Although differences are large, I believe the American people want us to reach an agreement on the budget. It is the responsibility of Congress and the President to put aside partisan differences for the common good of the nation.

The Coalition plan offers Congress and the President a real opportunity to find common ground and unite the American people behind a tough, honest, compassionate, and fair balanced budget that reflects basic American values and invests in our future. The Coalition plan may not be perfect, but it is a good starting point for real progress on the budget.

MAYOR TIERNEY DEFENDS NEW BEDFORD ECONOMY

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed recently to read a number of very uninformed attacks on Indian-run casinos. A number of people have extrapolated from their own personal opposition to gambling to make unfounded criticisms of Indian casinos, to denigrate the very important economic advantages these casinos have represented for American Indians and to inaccurately claim that they have been a source of legal problems. In addition, in some cases casinos can be a very important source of economic opportunity for people in addition to Indians who live in areas which have suffered economic losses beyond their control.

One such area is the city of New Bedford, MA, which I am privileged to represent in Congress. The proposal to establish a casino run by the Wampanoag Tribe in New Bedford has been overwhelmingly supported by the people of that city, who recently voted for it by a 3-to-1 margin in a referendum. It has unfortunately been the subject of a good deal of unfounded criticism. I was therefore very pleased to read in the Boston Globe for December 12 a very well argued essay by New Bedford Mayor Rosemary Tierney, in which she states the case for allowing New Bedford and the Wampanoag Tribe to go forward with this casino in very persuasive terms.

I have worked closely with Mayor Tierney, with labor representatives, with business leaders, and with a wide range of citizens to support economic development for New Bedford. All of these groups share the mayor's and my opinion that the casino is a very important part of this effort. The very hard working people of New Bedford have been hit by unfavorable international trade trends, and by the conservation driven restrictions on fishing. As we deal with these issues, we agree that the economic development that would result from the casino is essential in our effort to overcome the negative effects of these other trends. As the mayor notes in her well-documented and thoughtful essay,

New Bedford does not look upon gaming as a cure-all or quick fix for the local economy. The impact of the casino falls in two categories: employment and tax revenues. New jobs create new earnings and new spending. New spending, in turn, increases demands on suppliers, vendors, merchants, contractors. Thus new jobs create the need for yet more employment throughout the economy.

Mr. Speaker, because Mayor Tierney speaks with great authority on the need for economic development in the city of New Bedford, and because on this issue in particular she articulates a viewpoint that is shared by virtually all of us who are seriously concerned within the New Bedford area about economic improvement, and because the merits of Indian-run gambling operations are now a subject of some debate in this body, I ask the Mayor Tierney's article from the Boston Globe of Tuesday, December 12 be printed here.

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 12, 1995]

GAMING AND NEW BEDFORD'S FUTURE

(By Rosemary S. Tierney)

The City of New Bedford is not unique among older New England cities when considering the economic challenges it is confronting as the 21st century approaches. As mayor of this proud and historic city, I believe it is unique in demonstrating a frank willingness to acknowledge those challenges and to develop a systematic, long-term plan for overcoming them.

Throughout its long history, New Bedford has been bound to both national and international economic trends. Whaling and shipbuilding dominated the local economy in the early and mid-1800s. As the whaling industry declined, textiles became the dominant industry. Companies with such household names as Hathaway and Wamsutta made New Bedford their corporate homes. The manufacturing base was broadened by glass and metal-working factories, such as Revere Copper and Pairpoint Glass. In more recent times, the city's economic fate returned to the sea. For several years, New Bedford was the nation's No. 1 fishing port in the dollar value of its fleet's catch. New Bedford also became a site for quality needle trade industries, Polaroid, Aerovox and the Acushnet Co.'s Titleist golf ball plant.

Today New Bedford faces a challenge from the continuing decline in manufacturing, coupled with a fishing industry in crisis. These factors may be beyond local control, but the city can have an impact on the regional economic environment by employing its potential resources to maximum advantage.

Let me cite a few of those advantages being developed in New Bedford: a harbor with potential to handle increased shipping traffic; a location close to major transportation routes; and airport with a foreign trade zone and plans for a \$30 million expansion; a coastal resource laboratory and aquaculture center at the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth. In addition, plans

are in the works for establishment of a New Bedford national park and a commuter-rail link to Boston.

These projects are being over-shadowed today by the debate over casino gaming in Massachusetts and, in particular, the Wampanoag proposals to develop a casino/entertainment complex in New Bedford. Critics argue that gaming will only provide short-term economic gains, while the cost to society in regulation, diversion of funds, crime and related social problems will outweigh the benefits. Implicit in these arguments is that New Bedford is susceptible to promises by developers of a better tomorrow because of the plight of its local economy. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Wampanoag gaming proposal is the most comprehensive economic development initiative in the history of southeastern Massachusetts. It will provide some 5,000 jobs (plus 3,000 construction and temporary jobs), spur tourism, generate millions of dollars in revenues for the state and cities and towns, and allow Massachusetts vendors the opportunity to contract for services and goods to support the gaming and entertainment complex.

This is not just a New Bedford issue. It is a Worcester issue, a Springfield issue, a Fall River issue, a Taunton issue, a Brockton issue, a Lowell issue. It is an issue each mayor understands: job creation and economic development go hand-in-hand. New jobs can give hope and opportunity to thousands of hard working men and women—and can help build a stronger economic future for generations to come.

New Bedford does not look upon gaming as a cure-all or quick fix for the local economy. The impact of the casino falls in two categories: employment and tax revenues. New jobs create new earning and new spending. New spending in turn increases the demands on suppliers, vendor, merchants, contractors. Thus new jobs create the need for yet more employment throughout the economy.

If the local unemployment rate of 9.3 percent can be reduced to the statewide average of 5.1 percent, business in New Bedford and the area will certainly benefit. It has been the failure to reduce unemployment through new or expanded industry that has plagued this area for years. The Wampanoag project offers the city the opportunity to couple the project to other initiative, such as the harbor, airport and rail, to make them a reality.

It is estimated 25 percent of the gross revenue at the Foxwoods casino in Connecticut comes from Massachusetts residents. Those are revenues that leave this state by the busload every day. As Congress shifts federal responsibilities to the states, I urge the Legislature not to reject revenue sources that will be sorely needed in the not-too-distant future. Twenty-three states across the nation are beneficiaries of 130 compacts with 115 tribes. Massachusetts would not be reinventing the wheel.

Aside from minimizing or dismissing the economic potential of gaming, opponents employ the strategy of fear based upon threats of increased crime. As mayor of the host community, I am mindful of this threat. But there is no better prevention for crime than a job. The Wampanoag tribe not only supports strong regulation and has indicated a willingness to find its cost, it has encouraged the Legislature to maintain strict oversight over the new regulatory agency to ensure that it is composed of top professionals with knowledge of accounting and law enforcement. Instead of attempting to undermine a proposal legitimately put forward under federal law that will benefit this state and its people with economic opportunities, law enforcement personnel and prosecutors should insist the Gaming Commission be

staffed by people who will have impeccable reputations and integrity and be supported by a staff adequate to meet the job.

The task of rebuilding New Bedford and the region is vital to southeastern Massachusetts. The Legislature has an opportunity to make an important contribution to this effort by approving the compact between the state and the Wampanoag tribe. The area has always had an enormous potential for economic growth and development. The gaming/entertainment complex offers New Bedford a catalyst for the full economic recovery. I urge the Legislature to approve the compact expeditiously and to avoid arguments that seem more focused on scoring short-term political points than on seeking pragmatic solutions to bring to this state a well regulated and managed gaming industry.

COMMEMORATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, by Presidential proclamation, December 10–16 has been designated Human Rights Week. As Americans prepare to celebrate the holidays and the coming new year, I hope that each of us will reflect upon the blessings we reap because of the deep commitment to human rights that America stands for. Indeed the world looks to us as a beacon or hope because of our tradition of respect for and continual effort to bring to life the freedoms enshrined in our Constitution.

Those who have suffered from a denial of the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, that we, in this country, often take for granted, known how important the achievement of human rights really is. In countries such as North Korea, China, Vietnam, Cuba, Burma, and Bosnia, people struggle to win the liberty that we have enjoyed for over 200 years.

In the United States, respect for international human rights has long been supported on a bipartisan basis. We have enjoyed many successes in advancing human rights, evidenced by the collapse of communism in Europe, the defeat of Communist subversion in Central America, and in the defeat of aggression in the Persian Gulf. We understand the role that human rights can play in advancing democracy and economic development with free markets. For instance, in the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and its satellites, human rights was a key aspect of the difference between the quality of life in Western and Communist societies, and therefore became decisive as the people of the Communist bloc rose against their governments.

The importance of restoring human rights has been recognized in the Dayton peace agreement for Bosnia. We hope and pray that as our troops are deployed, the Bosnian people will seize the opportunity for justice and reconciliation, so that all the people of Bosnia can rejoin the community of nations as a free people. In Rwanda, success in restoring an acceptable standard of human rights will determine whether Rwandan refugees can return home in peace and safety, and rebuild shattered lives.

Maintaining international standards for human rights, promoting these standards, and

encouraging their adoption where necessary remain a key aspiration of our Nation's policy. Let us resolve to continue our efforts to ensure for all the enjoyment of human rights.

HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit for the RECORD Ambassador Madeleine Albright's remarks on the human rights situation in Burma to the U.N. General Assembly Third Committee. I join Ambassador Albright's endorsement of the U.N. resolution to urge the Government of Burma to cease its violations of internationally recognized human rights.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend Ambassador Albright for her tremendous work on this issue. I encourage all Members to support the work of our U.N. Representative as she relentlessly pursues the cause of Burmese democracy leader Aung San Suu Kyi. Ambassador Albright had a great meeting in Burma this fall Aung San Suu Kyi.

Recent developments in Burma have given us cause for great concern. It is imperative that the governing State Law and Order Restoration Council understand that the United States and the international community will not tolerate threats or actions that suppress the advancement of the democratic movement in Burma.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, THIRD COMMITTEE, HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN BURMA, DECEMBER 11, 1995

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss my Government's decision to join consensus on the resolution concerning the human rights situation in Burma, despite some reservations that prevented us from cosponsoring.

The resolution reflects a tremendous effort by the Swedish mission to develop a strong consensus text, and my government endorses strongly the purposes and recommendations contained in that text.

We join with the other members of this Assembly in urging the Burmese Government to cease its violations of internationally recognized human rights. And we urge the government to begin a substantive political dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi, other democratic leaders and representatives of ethnic groups concerning the future of the country. These recommendations are at the heart of the Assembly resolution, and we believe the Government of Burma should respond favorably to them.

The United States was not able to cosponsor the resolution because of three issues that we believe could have been dealt with more precisely or urgently.

First, we would have tempered the language in paragraph 17, which welcomes the cessation of hostilities between the Government of Burma and various ethnic groups, because the Burmese Army has not fully honored those ceasefires.

Second, we believe the resolution should have included language similar to that adopted by the UN Human Rights Commission last spring, encouraging the Secretary-General to hold discussions with the Burmese Government for the purpose of stimulating progress towards democratization and national reconciliation.